

Appln No. 09/693,647  
Amdt. Dated August 3, 2004  
Response to Office action of May 28, 2004

10

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### **Claims**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-34. By this amendment, claims 1, 4-5, 20 and 23-24 have been amended. Therefore claims 1-34 remain pending in the application.

#### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102*

Claims 1-13, 15, 17-31, and 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Graf et al. (USPN: 5, 631, 984) (hereinafter referred to as "Graf"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Graf discloses a method and apparatus for compressing images of financial instruments and other documents. Graf discloses a method of scanning a cheque, for example, using a scanner in a manner well known in the art to produce a digital image of the cheque. This electronic image is then encoded and certain static information is extracted and stored. Additionally, dynamic information is extracted from the cheque and stored (see column 2, lines 43-60 and column 5, lines 5-65).

The coded data of Graf is in the form of magnetic ink character recognition (MICR) line 16 that typically includes a code identifying an issuing bank, an account number and a cheque number. Hence, the coded data in Graf contains certain information identifying the cheque being scanned.

In contrast, the Applicant's invention provides a control interface having coded data printed thereon where the coded data itself identifies a unique location of each of a plurality of reference points on the control interface. This feature is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Graf as the coded data taught by Graf provides for document identification only.

To clarify the above distinction, independent claims 1, 4-5, 20 and 23-24 have been amended to state that the coded data is indicative of "a plurality of reference points of the control interface, the coded data identifying a unique location of each of the reference points relative to the control interface."

Basis for the amendments made to the claims can be found in the specification as originally filed at, for example, page 21, line 25 to page 22, line 1, where the optical sensing device is referred to as a "pen" and the coded data are referred to as "tags":

*"A location-indicating tag contains a tag ID which, when translated through the tag map associated with the tagged region, yields a unique tag location within the region. The tag-relative location of the pen is added to this tag location to yield the location of the pen within the region. This in turn is used to determine the location of the pen relative to a user interface element in the page description associated with the region. Not only is the user interface element itself identified, but a location relative to the user interface element is identified. Location-indicating tags therefore trivially support the capture of an absolute pen path in the zone of a particular user interface element."*

Appln No. 09/693,647  
Amdt. Dated August 3, 2004  
Response to Office action of May 28, 2004

11

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103*

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graf in view of Tseng et al. (USPN: 6,119,159) (hereinafter Tseng).

Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection is now moot in light of the above-described amendments distinguishing the independent claims from Graf. Tseng does not disclose, teach or suggest coded data identifying a unique location of each of a plurality of reference points relative to a control interface.

Claims 14 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graf in view of Interval Research Corporation (WO 99/18487).

Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection is now moot in light of the above-described amendments distinguishing the independent claims from Graf. Interval Research Corporation does not disclose, teach or suggest coded data identifying a unique location of each of a plurality of reference points relative to a control interface.

*Conclusion*

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL LAPSTUN

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JACQUELINE ANNE LAPSTUN

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)  
Telephone: +612 9818 6633  
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762